



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Mr. Kipling and Mr. Davidson are essentially poets of virility. They are in a sense realists, but they see romance in reality. They believe that the basic passions of men, forming as they do so much of life, call for expression as full, are capable of expression as exalting, as intellectuality, spirituality, dream. Anti-ascetic and optimistic, these three poets have taken to heart Mr. Meredith's declaration that "blood and brain and spirit" joined, fused in the man, are necessary for his true felicity. In the words of their masters—Browning, Whitman, and Mr. Meredith—these three younger men are singing "the wild joys of living," "the procreant rage of the world," "iron hymns." They, as well as their masters, have exerted a very evident influence upon contemporary verse-writers, most of whom show comparatively little influence of Tennyson and the pre-Raphaelites.

Prof. Edwin W. Bowen read the next paper, his subject being "The Development of Long *u* in Modern English."

The subject of this study was to show the historical development in Modern English of long *u*. Beginning with ME. the author showed that the original AS. *u* did not persist, but passed into the ME. diphthong *ou*. The Modern-English long *u* came into ME. from three sources; namely, 1. certain original AS. diphthongs *eu* and *ēu*; 2. certain French *u*'s, which were introduced into English from the Anglo-Norman dialect chiefly; 3. Late ME. close *ō*, which in the seventeenth century developed into long *u*. The early Modern-English long *u*, which was pronounced almost like the Modern-French *u*, persisted to the eighteenth century, when it passed into the diphthong *iu* with the stress shifted to the second element. This has continued to the present, but with considerable modifications, giving the variety of the long *u*-sounds of the present day.

The last paper that was read was by Prof. J. L. Hall on "Experiments in Translating Anglo-Saxon Poetry." Two more papers, "The Influence of German Literature in America from 1800 to 1825," by Dr. Frederick H. Wilkens, and "Archaisms in Modern French," by Mrs. Thérèse F. Colin, were read merely by title.

At this session the officers for the ensuing year were elected. The changes consisted in the election of Prof. H. C. G. von Jagemann as President, and of Professors L. E. Menger, H. S. White and W. D. Toy to the Executive Council, to take the places of Professors C. T. Winchester, Bliss Perry, and A. R. Hohlfeld.

The programme of the meeting was excellent throughout, although there seems to be an increasing demand for a larger number of papers

of general interest, and for more discussion of the papers dealing with special topics.

Columbia University, New York, was selected as the place of meeting for the next year. The Secretary of the Association, Prof. Bright, is at present engaged in making arrangements with representatives of other philological societies in the United States, for holding a Philological Congress in the year 1900.

THOMAS STOCKHAM BAKER.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE HOMUNCULUS-HELENA THEORY, AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE HELENA DRAMA AND ITS ANTECEDENTS.

IN the November and December issues of MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xiii, 1898, Veit Valentin, Professor in Frankfurt on the Main, and member of the Executive Council of the Goethe-Gesellschaft, editor of a number of 'Deutsche Schulausgaben,' and author of a series of 'Ästhetische Schriften,' has an article on 'Goethes Homunkulus,' the object of which is to uphold his Homunculus-Helena Theory against an attack which had been made upon it in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xii, 1897, No. 2 (Feb.), and to refute the explanation of Homunculus which was advanced in the same place. Every line of the twenty columns of the article shows how completely Veit Valentin is convinced of the correctness of his theory, and how far superior he considers his method to that of his opponent. Nevertheless, it would have been more fair on his part if he had really examined his opponent's method instead of condemning it without a hearing,¹ and a great deal more

¹ Valentin asserts again and again that in the article in the February issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES for 1897, no attention was paid to the dramatical connection in which Homunculus appears. He might have convinced himself that the greater part of col. 77 and parts of cols. 78 and 79 deal with the relation of Homunculus and the Galatea scene to the second and third acts. The evolution of Homunculus has since been presented in a similar way by Dietze in the *Ztschr. f. d. Phil.* xxx, 2, p. 244 f. and by Thomas: *Goethes Faust*, Vol. ii; Second Part, Boston, 1897. It shall not be maintained that the division of the Classical Walpurgis-Night as given in col. 77 is correct. The Classical Walpurgis-Night is dominated by the contrast of the worlds of the land and of the sea. Its dramatical aspect will be treated more fully in a special article entitled: *The Evolution of the Classical Walpurgis-Night and the Scene in Hades*, which is about to appear in *Americana Germanica*.

wise, if he had carefully investigated the poet's evidence regarding the Helena drama and its antecedents, instead of forcing both the Helena and the Classical Walpurgis-Night into a dramatic structure evolved from his own mind. In the following, first the theory for which Valentin is contending and which he has now published four times² will be restated; then a résumé of the preceding criticism and counter-criticism will be given; and finally a decision will be sought by means of a historical examination of Goethe's own evidence in the case.

The Homunculus-Helena theory is, in short, as follows: Helena and her maids and Menelaus and his followers consist of three component parts: the shade which gives them form and personality; life which animates them; and matter which makes them material beings of flesh and blood. The entire second act has the purpose of preparing for the union of those three parts. Homunculus stays in his bottle until the shades of Helena and the others are at hand. Then inspired by the beauty of Galatea he shatters his bottle and unites with the elements. The union of life and matter is at once built into the shades, which until then were empty,³ and transforms them into material bodies of flesh and blood.⁴ These bodies have full reality, but Helena and her maids are at the same time conscious of their artificiality. What formerly was Homunculus is now the life of all those bodies and manifests itself also in Euphorion. When the maid whom Euphorion has caught dissolves, what was Homunculus goes up into the air; when Helena returns to Hades, what was Homunculus remains in her garments which carry Faust aloft; when the maids consider their future, what was Homunculus remaining connected with the matter of the elements is to continue life in "den Verkörperungen der vier Elemente"⁵ in ever new

forms. Only with this assumption, it is claimed, Homunculus has a dramatic purpose, only so the appearance of Helena can be understood dramatically, only so the "grosse Lücke" between the second and third acts is filled out.⁶

The manner in which Helena receives her corporeal being, says Valentin, undergoes the following changes. According to the oldest designs it was through a magic ring, according to the *Ankündigung*, of Dec. 17, 1826, it was by means of the sojourn in a certain place (that is, Sparta), according to the final execution of the drama, whatever Valentin may mean by that, it was through a spiritual force (that is, Homunculus).⁷

In the article in the issue of February, 1897, the attempt was made to show the untenability of this theory mainly by trying to prove, on the one hand, that Helena and her maids have no material bodies of flesh and blood and hence have no need of Homunculus, and on the other hand, that Homunculus is obliged to take the road of evolution and, thereby, is debarred from uniting with the shades of Helena and her maids. Besides, the fact was emphasized that no one before Valentin had ever thought of such a combination of Homunculus and Helena, and that Goethe himself had nowhere given the slightest hint that he intended so strange a device.

Of these points, only the first has been combated by Valentin with evidence from Goethe which, however, as the reader may see in the note below,⁸ is not conclusive. The second is simply denied on the strength of the theory which ought first to be proved,⁹ and the third is headed off by a wail over the preoccupation of the public with regard to the Second Part of Faust,¹⁰ an argument which may be justified where an allegorical or symbolical interpretation of certain persons or passages is con-

² In the two books mentioned above, in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, vol. xvi, and in the issues of MOD. LANG. NOTES cited above.

³ See especially *Erläuterung*, etc., p. 87; 'dann entsteht beim Zerschellen der Flasche die Vereinigung der Lebenskraft mit den Elementen und baut sie in die bis dahin leere Gestalt des Schattenbildes als lebendigen Stoff hinein.'

⁴ MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xiii, col. 466: 'Hier handelt es sich aber . . . um eine materielle, körperliche Wiederbelebung, um eine Erscheinung in Fleisch und Blut, etc.'

⁵ L. c., col. 442.

⁶ L. c., col. 464. Valentin seems to have misunderstood a passage in Eckermann's letter to Goethe, Sept. 14, 1830.

⁷ L. c., col. 440, and in the books cited above.

⁸ L. c., col. 438: 'durch einen magischen Ring ist ihr die Körperlichkeit wiedergegeben,' sage nicht ich, sondern sagt Goethe, etc., and col. 438 f.: 'Als wahrhaft lebendig' sagt Goethe—Gerber weiss es besser.' As for the first point Helena is called in the same place a 'Halbwirklichkeit,' a semi-reality. A semi-reality is not a material reality of flesh and blood. For the second point see cols. 220-221 of this article.

⁹ L. c., col. 467. ¹⁰ L. c., cols. 464 and 467.

cerned, but which surely ought to have no weight with regard to the recognition of an important dramatic motif. That would be presuming too much on the prepossession and lack of insight of all readers and critics before himself.

Though it should, therefore, seem that Valentin's theory still stands as much disproved as it appeared to Prof. Poll of Harvard, when he reported in that sense to the *Euphorion*,¹¹ though it might be urged that it is incompatible with Goethe's regard for the eternal laws of nature or with his art as a dramatic poet, though, finally, it might be shown that it does not even explain what it purposes to do, namely, the arrival of Helena in Sparta with the idea that she is coming from Troy, etc., it shall this time be attacked with the aid of evidence from Goethe himself only.

This evidence is found in volume xv, 2, of the Weimar Goethe edition, in the extracts from Goethe's diaries in Erich Schmidt's *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt* and in Eckermann's *Gespräche mit Goethe*, all of which books must undoubtedly have been accessible to Valentin all this time.

In the *Ankündigung* of his *Helena* of Dec. 17, 1826,¹² Goethe tells us that it was the part which Helena plays in the old legend and in the puppet play that induced him not to neglect so important a motif in his own work. In accordance with this statement we see him take from the legend, in his plan of 1775,¹³ not only those traits which are still preserved in the final version, namely, the twofold entrance of Helena, her having a son with Faust and her disappearing simultaneously with that son,¹⁴ but also that it is Mephistopheles who brings her from Orcus, that he takes her to Germany¹⁵ instead of Greece, and that Faust is yet called a new Paris. In other respects the plan of 1775 already differs from the legend,

¹¹ Band v, Heft 2, p. 358 (*l. c.*, col. 468).

¹² Weimar Edition (—W.E.) xv, 2, p. 199 f. Repeated in *Kunst und Alterthum*, Band vi, Heft 1 (1827), p. 202 f.

¹³ W.E. xv, 2, p. 173 ff., more especially 175 f.

¹⁴ In the *Helena* drama, to be sure, there is a slight apparent interval, yet mother and son are still inseparable, Helena exclaiming: 'Persephoneia, nimm den Knaben auf und mich.'

¹⁵ That the castle must be sought in Germany may be inferred from the general situation and the *Paratipomenon*, no. 84, l. 14 (*l. c.*, p. 184).

and foreshadows quite a number of new traits which reappear on a higher plane, and more poetically developed, in the finished drama. Faust has an 'unendliche Sehnsucht nach der einmal erkannten höchsten Schönheit.' Helena is limited to a certain territory. She meets Faust in a castle. He has become a mediæval knight. She is no longer a source of evil to him. Their son dances and sings as soon as he is born. His lack of restraint is his ruin. He dies in connection with a fight. His death severs the union of his parents, and when on parting, Helena throws herself into her husband's arms, he clasps only her empty garments in his embrace.

In one point, however, the plan of 1775 differs both from the legend and the final version, and that is in connecting Helena's and her son's corporeal existence with a magic ring, a device which the legend did not need because in it Helena simply appears and disappears according to mediæval beliefs, and with which the drama could dispense, because in it the revivification of Helena is founded on ancient tradition. But, although in the drama Helena's return to life is no longer connected with the ring, yet obtained through the intercession of Manto, the ring itself does not immediately disappear from Goethe's plans. In a partial scheme,¹⁶ for example, it is still attached to the beginning of Mephistopheles' activity: 'Übergang ins magische Unheimliches Ring' and only gradually it is entirely renounced. Quite a similar gradual renunciation of a motif for which a better and more organic one had been substituted may be observed in the case of the interlocutory¹⁷ in which Phorkyas was to apologize for the rapid growth of Euphorion by a reference to the British stage, where a little child in the course of the action develops into a hero. For after Goethe had hit upon the comparison with Hermes, the interlocutory and the chorus 'Nennst du ein Wunder das?' once appear in the same scheme.¹⁸ In the final version, however, both the ring and the interlocutory are given up.

¹⁶ *Paratip.*, No. 162, l. 7 f.: 'Übergang ins magische Unheimliches Ring.' Cf. also No. 165, l. 17 and No. 166, l. 2.

¹⁷ *Paratip.*, No. 176.

¹⁸ *Paratip.*, No. 166, l. 14: 'Phorkyas interloquirt'—l. 15: 'Nennst du ein Wunder das?'

The new manner of Helena's revivification which could dispense with the magic ring was considered by the poet a matter of great importance. This is proved by the introduction to *Helena* of June 10, 1826.¹⁹ In the first place this introduction was written immediately upon the preliminary completion²⁰ of the drama, and in the second place it explains nothing but the one single thing—how and upon what conditions Helena returns to life. All the other events which now form the first and second acts of the completed Second Part are still left to the imagination. Only in the following half-year, or rather towards the close of it, in the months of November and December, Goethe elaborated a more detailed introduction. The schemes of Nov. 9, and 10(?),²¹ cover the entire second act and give at least a few more hints as to how the events of that act were being planned, while the sketch of four folio pages of Dec. 15,²² and the *Ankündigung* of seven pages of Dec. 17, contain a rather full outline of both the first and second acts as they were then intended.

In the *Ankündigung*, of Dec. 17, where Homunculus still appears with a body and hence even according to Valentin's admission²³ can have nothing whatever to do with Helena, the revivification is still conceived as it was in the introduction of June 10, only the details which were given for the first time in the scheme of Nov. 9, are still further increased so that the whole scene in Hades now occupies forty lines. Manto descends with Faust to Hades and makes a plea for the release of Helena. This

¹⁹ *Paralip.*, No. 123, 2, p. 213 f.

²⁰ Erich Schmidt, *l. c.*, p. 99: '8 Juni. Völliger Abschluss der Helena. Vorbereitung des Mundums.' Besides: '13 Juni. Überlegung noch einiger wirksamer Chöre zur Helena. 24 Juni. Völliger Abschluss der Helena, durch Umschreiben einiger Bogen.' Between this day and January 25, 1827, when the manuscript was packed in order to be sent to Cotta, there is no indication of any consequential change whatsoever, only some filing seems to have been done. The only entry in the diary which indicates such filing is: '21 November. Revidirte an der Helena. The date of the final completion of the Helena drama is, therefore, June 24, 1826.

²¹ *Paralip.*, No. 99. The scheme of Nov. 9 is in the notes. The date of Nov. 10 appears probable from the diary, *l. c.*, p. 100 '10 November. Das Schema zu Fausts zweytem Theil fortgesetzt.'

²² *Paralip.*, No. 123, 1 in the notes.

²³ *L. c.*, col. 439: 'Auch in diesem Entwurfe Goethes hat Homunkulus mit Helena nichts zu thun.'

plea is based on the strength of precedents. Protesilaus, Alceste, Eurydice had been released; even Helena herself had once before received permission to return to life in order to be wedded to Achilles. The argument is successful. Helena is to return to the upper world upon the condition that she be limited to Sparta, as in the case of Achilles she had been limited to the island of Leuke. She is to appear alive, or 'truly alive' at Sparta, and it is to be left to the new wooer to see how he can win her favor. Her release, therefore, is granted in accordance with the precedents in Greek tradition, and more especially in analogy to her own former return to life in the case of Achilles. Corporeal being is *implied in the release* and not, as Valentin surmises, obtained by the 'Zaubermittel (!)' of a sojourn in a certain place.

Since this conception of the revivification of Helena, as was shown above, was written *after* the drama had been completed, it follows that the limitation to Sparta should be interpreted from the drama as we have it. In Goethe's mind a stay in Arcadia must, therefore, not have seemed to conflict with this limitation to Sparta, whether he thought of the fact that parts of Arcadia had belonged to Sparta in history, or whether Helena's sovereignty extended Sparta over Arcadia as well as over the other states of the Peloponnesus, or whether, which would seem most likely, Sparta is to be conceived as a contrast to Germany where Helena, as we saw, was taken in the legend and in the plan of 1775.

Also the much debated question of the nature of Helena's corporeal being can only be considered from the standpoint of the *Ankündigung* in connection with the drama. Helena is to be released from Hades, and is to appear in Sparta 'truly alive.' For a while she distinguishes herself in no manner from a being that is truly alive in the ordinary material sense of the word, but soon the aspect changes both with herself and with her maids. She feels drawn towards Orcus; she is vanishing away and becoming a phantom to herself; her soul is ready to leave the form of all forms upon which the sun has ever shone;²⁴ and when she does depart her corporeal being actually

²⁴ *Ll.* 8836 f., 8881; 8904 ff.

vanishes, without leaving any material trace, in exactly the same manner as in the plan of 1775, where she is called a 'semi-reality.' Her son's rapid birth and development are contrary to all laws of the material world; his death seems to take place in consonance with them, but his corporeal being vanishes at once without leaving a trace. The maids are called phantoms by Mephistopheles; at another time they are doubtful as to whether they are not shades following Hermes' golden staff to Hades; one of their number changes into a flame to tease Euphorion, as the Lamiae transform themselves to make sport of Mephistopheles; all the others, except Panthalis, finally join nature or the elements in their capacity of spirits,²⁵ and the Phantasmagory is ended.

With this wonderful world Faust associates without difficulty. Just as in the *Ankündigung* Chiron, who also according to Valentin's opinion is a phantom, carries him through Thessaly, Helena bears him a son. At the same time he is perfectly conscious that this world is transient, for he says to Helena 'Dasein ist Pflicht und wär's ein Augenblick' and, accordingly, he does not shed a tear nor feel a pang when all is over. Only the uplifting influence of the whole experience remains with him. But can this revived world have more than a poetic reality? Must not any attempt to attribute to it a material reality involve us in the greatest intellectual difficulties, or even lead to such lamentable failures as Valentin's Homunculus-Helena theory?

That this theory is a failure can now easily be seen. Goethe tells us five times, June 10, Nov. 9, and 10(?), Dec. 15 and 17, 1826, the last time in forty lines with all due detail, that he has conceived the revivification of Helena as

²⁵ Ll. 8930; 9116 ff.; 9806 f.; the stage directions read in H. 68: 'Sie verwandelt sich und flammt und lodert'; 9989 ff. Also *Eschermann*, 29 Jan. 1827: 'Auf den Gedanken, dass der Chor . . . sich den Elementen zuwirft, thue ich mir wirklich etwas zugute.' Notice that the terms: *Idol* (888r), *Seele* (8904), *Gespenster* (8930) and *Geister* (9990) are all used synonymously. In the sketch of Dec. 15 the Pompejans and Caesareans are called *Geister* and *Gespenster* in the same clause (*l. c.*, p. 206). The phantasmagorical character of the third act appears also from l. 22 in the interlocutory of Phorkyas (*l. c.*, p. 234): '*Gespensisch* spinnt der Dichtung Faden sich immer fort.' Ll. 9992-9995 show that the spirits of the maids will 'preside' over the life of the branches. Compare also H. 57 (*l. c.*, p. 129): 'Lass uns dort der Trauben pflegen.' The Phantasmagory now begins at Pharsalus.

taking place in strict analogy to her former return to life in the case of Achilles, and carries this analogy so far as to give her son by the second Achilles, the very name of the one she had by the first and even, in imagination at least, his wings;²⁶ Goethe writes these accounts of her revivification, not before he had composed his drama and when he might still have changed both the drama and its presuppositions, but *after* he had finished the *Helena* and when, therefore, all fundamental alterations in the presuppositions were out of question; Goethe moreover enjoins upon the reader that the revivification and what precedes it should be 'als vorausgehend genau gekannt und gründlich überdacht.' In spite of all this, Valentin has the boldness to replace Goethe's own organic introduction by his fantastic and artificial Homunculus-Helena theory.

And how is his analytic proof in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*?²⁷ He starts out with the abstract, though not incorrect assumption, that the manner in which Helena and her maids dissolve must contain a clue as to how the poet conceived their coming into life. Then he interprets this dissolution to suit his theory, and thus by sheer force of necessity arrives at that which he set out to prove. One glance at the chronology of the introduction, or the schemes, or the *Ankündigung*, might have shown him that his æsthetic deductions are all in the air and that, Homunculus not being available for Helena and her maids, on the contrary his interpretation of their dissolution must be wrong.

Finally, the so-called historical investigation which Valentin claims to have made,²⁸ and by which he discovered that Helena receives cor-

²⁶ Hederich (Goethe's Mythological Handbook) bearbeitet von J. J. Schwabe, 1770: sub Euphorion: 'ein Sohn des Achilles und der Helena, welcher in den glücklichen Inseln von ihnen erzeugt, u. mit Flügeln geboren wurde.' Mr. A. Sträubing of Weimar has had the kindness to look up this reference for me.

²⁷ Band xvi, p. 132: 'Wenn wir einen Organismus in seinem Bestande verstehen lernen wollen, so bleibt nichts Anders übrig als ihn zu zerlegen. . . . Da man uns wir es um so dankbarer begrüßen, wenn uns der Dichter selbst in der Zerlegung unterstützt. . . . denn so können wir wenigstens mit Sicherheit erkennen, wie er sich das Ganze gedacht hat. Glücklicherweise ist dies aber auch gerade das, was wir hier suchen.'

Also *l. c.*, col. 440 and *Erläuterung*, p. 104.

²⁸ *l. c.*, col. 434; larger book, p. 153 f.; *Erläuterung*, p. 84.

poreal being first through the magic ring, then by means of the sojourn in Sparta, and in the last place through Homunculus. The first item is actually correct; the second is wrong because, as we have seen above, she was revived in analogy with her return to life for the sake of Achilles; the third is impossible because the time for further changes had expired with the completion of the drama. Hence the revivification through Homunculus which Valentin palms off as a 'geniale Umgestaltung' of Goethe is nothing but a fantastic lucubration of his own brains, the 'Genialität' of which may be left to the judgment of the reader.

That Goethe still adhered to his idea of the revivification of Helena—as of course he was obliged to do because it was the basis of the Helena drama—when the Classical Walpurgis-Night was finished, is proved by the existence of a scheme of June 18, 1830, entitled 'Prolog des dritten Acts'²⁹ which sets a double seal on the final overthrow of Valentin's hypothesis. In the first place, the conditions of Helena's return to life are still the same as they were in 1826; in the second place, the union of Homunculus with the sea is now separated from Helena's release from Hades, not only by the close of a scene, but by the close of an act. Instead of seeing, as Valentin³⁰ wishes him to, the threads that connect Homunculus with Helena, the spectator sees the curtain of the act fall after Homunculus has become wedded to the sea, and when he sees it rise again Manto has not yet even made the request for Helena's release.

That the execution of this prologue was finally abandoned does not alter the case. Two facts remain established by Goethe's own authority. First, that in 1826 he finished the Helena drama without planning that Homunculus should have a share in Helena's revivification, since at that time Homunculus was conceived as having a body from the start, and second, that in 1830 he completed the Classical Walpurgis-Night without intending that the shades of Helena and her maids, and Menelaus and his men, should unite with Homunculus, since, apart from other reasons, Helena was con-

ceived as being still in Hades for a good while after Homunculus had been wedded to the sea.

How easily could Valentin have seen all this himself and kept from expending a vast amount of labor and ingenuity on a useless hypothesis, had he not had as profound a disregard for place, in the case of the projected scene in Hades, as he had for time, in the case of the chronology of the *Ankündigung* of the *Helena* and the sketch and schemes preceding it. He might have found in the Weimar edition, which was always at his elbow, and of which he is himself a co-editor, that Goethe states or intimates there in no less than eight different places—in the introduction of June 10, in the schemes of Nov. 9, and 10(?), in the sketch of the *Ankündigung* of Dec. 15, and in the *Ankündigung* itself of Dec. 17 of the year 1826, and in the schemes of Jan.(?), Feb. 6,³¹ and June 18 of 1830,—that Faust's arrival in Hades and the scene in Hades were immediately to precede the Helena drama. But as place is overlooked in his æsthetical deductions just as much as time, he blandly assumes in both of his books, in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* and in MOD. LANG. NOTES, that Helena's shade is present when Homunculus shatters his glass, and calmly maintains that the scene in Hades remained unwritten, because

'die strenge Folgerichtigkeit seiner Entwicklung der Handlung verbot es ihm (Goethe), in die durch Zauber für eine Nacht lebendig gewordene Geisterwelt eine Handlung einzuschalten, die in der mit bleibendem Dasein ausgestatteten natürlichen Wirklichkeit der antiken Götterwelt (Hades) vor sich gehen müsste.'³²

though Goethe never dreamed of *inserting* it, but always intended to put it at the close.

If a writer is so infatuated with a pet theory that he no longer pays attention to the conditions of time and place, as laid down by the poet for whom he professes the greatest admiration, he can hardly be expected to examine without bias the remarks of a critic whom he ranks with the interpreters of a by-gone age. For this reason no attempt will be made to show in detail that the supposed inaccuracies in the article of February, 1897, are all due to misun-

³¹ *Paralip.*, no. 124 and no. 125.

³² *Erläuterung*, p. 97. Compare also the larger book, p. 175 f. The italics are not Valentin's.

²⁹ *Paralip.*, no. 157.

³⁰ *L. c.*, col. 467 and *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, xvi, p. 143.

derstanding on his part.³³ Nor will it be necessary to re-enter upon a discussion of the question of method, after it has been seen whether the method for which Valentin claims so much has led him. It may, however, be remarked that the fall of the Homunculus-Helena theory does not only discomfit Valentin's dramatic interpretation of the second and third acts, but that it also gives a severe shock to the dramatic fabric which he has constructed for the whole of Faust. Had it not been for the reverent preservation of the documents which show the gradual progress and development of Goethe's work, the Homunculus-Helena theory might have continued for many more years to hold a large proportion of the readers and students of Faust under the magic spell with which the brilliant style and the assurance of its originator have invested it.

ADOLF GERBER.

Earlham College.

A PREPOSITIONAL HITCH.

"Is *on* or *of* right in this place?"

"Well?"

"... the pleasant store of learning that they got when they read to each other *on* winter nights ..."—Do you want to say *on* or *of*?"

"I want to conform to usage."

"That's why I asked," she said.

"In such a place I usually say *on*, if I use a preposition at all."

"*Of* seems more natural to me."

"Perhaps I have something," and I went to a box of mems.—"Here is something, but not much."—Then I marked five quotations, (*a*), (*b*), etc., and laid them on the table one after another, with little pauses between, waiting for comments.

(*a*) "... its quaint, gray, castled city where the bells clash of a Sunday ..."—Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Silverado Squatters*, p. 63.

"I thought so."

³³ As Valentin might have inferred from the absence of quotation marks, it was not intended to give his views literally, but only in substance and much condensed. See also the misunderstandings in the interpretations of the luminosity of the phosphorescent atoms (*l. c.*, col. 439) and of the passage referring to the completion of the Classical Walpurgis-Night (cols. 442 and 443). In the latter place, Valentin adds a learned discourse on Goethe's use of 'ins Unendliche,' without noticing that the passage in question does not contain that expression at all.

(*b*) "... when old Mr. Crewe, the curate ... delivered inaudible sermons on a Sunday ..."—George Eliot, *Scenes of Clerical Life* (Edinburgh, cabinet ed.), vol. ii, p. 51.

"Oh!"

(*c*) "... it was a correct thing to be seen at church of a Sunday ..."—Thackeray, *Pendennis* (London, 1869), vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 18.

"Two to one."

(*d*) "My brother had arrived from Persia only a few hours before. This was on the Tuesday."—J. H. Newnan, *Apologia*, ch. i.

"Oh, that doesn't count. That's different."

(*e*) "When they hear that up at the hall they play tennis on Sunday afternoons."—Augustus Jessopp, *The Trials of a Country Parson* (London, 1890), p. 39.

"One way is just as good as the other," and her eyes turned to the MS. again.

"It's a pity that people who write about good English haven't reached that conclusion in a lot of cases. But, my dear, you got there on too slight support.—In fact, you jumped. When there are only two conclusions to choose from, you are just as likely to be right as not—if you don't care which is which."

"But there were *four* here."

"Prove it."

"(1), (*a*) might be right and (*b*) wrong; (2), (*b*) might be right and (*a*) wrong; (3), (*a*) and (*b*) might both be right; (4), (*a*) and (*b*) might both be wrong,—yes, and (5), (*a*) and (*b*) might be right or wrong according to the way you used them,—and half-a-dozen more, for aught I know."

"Let's go on with the work. Publishers don't care about such things."

"Men's minds are different from women's minds."

"That doesn't fret them."

"Women are right a great deal oftener than men are, and it doesn't take them half so long either."

"There isn't any place for that opinion in this book."—(Men must never doubt the superiority of men.)

Naturally, after that, one got together more examples that would throw light on the prepositional question at issue. Such success as has been reached in stringing them on a discriminative theory is shown below.

When an act or occurrence is *not* thought of as customary, *on* is used (or understood) before